

Beacher, Andrew

From: Robinson, Gigi
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 2:19 PM
To: Keirce, Clifford; Austin, Erin; Bayless, Glen; Syska, Helena; Ruedisueli, Kevin; Maio, Peggy; Klancher, Robert; Ronis, Valdis
Cc: Beacher, Andrew; Mosurak, Lou; Merrithew, John E..
Subject: Final CTP
Attachments: CTP Final.docx

Attached are my comments on the final CTP.

Thank you Andy and Lou for the indexing in the back.

Gigi Robinson
Planning Commission
Leesburg District

CTP Final

Concerns:

1. The CTP should be carefully worded for certain areas in the County (Route 50 is one, Glascock Fields in particular would be a trigger) so that proffers can be properly acted upon by both the County and the current property owner. A review of all proffers should be completed to insure that there aren't any unexpected consequences.

2. Letter to BOS Item 1. (Also see item 5 becoming item 1)

It might make it easier for the Board to grasp if we cite some examples of plans/ordinances for the Board to consider. Perhaps we could insert after 1st sentence: "This aligning of County documents might include the Chesapeake Bay ordinance, the Limestone Overlay District and Steep Slope, for example." *added to memo*

3. Letter to BOS Item 5. *modified*

Proffers are critical to the County. I believe that sentence 2 is misleading in that it infers that there are extensive, un-used proffers that need just a little more money to "close gaps in the CTP network". It is my understanding that there is more than just a little more money for most "gap" solutions.

Also of concern, is that there are several parties working with developers. These parties may not be working in concert within the County. Therefore, proffers may be "allocated" for two separate parties, for two separate areas of the County, for two separate developers. Without a central repository of road proffers, confusion may reign.

Because we are dealing with money or money associated with construction, I would like to see the section strengthened and the item moved to first position in the memo for primary consideration for scarce resources.

4. Letter to BOS Item 10.

In item 10, we are asking for two separate items, albeit related issues. I would like to break them up into the Route 28 issue and then the extension to Maryland. The first is an effort that is contained in the County. The second is something that will likely have to come from a federal mandate to the two separate States. Therefore, I would like to suggest something along the following lines.

10. The County is currently considering an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to enhance the development of commercial and residential space along Route 28. ~~The County's Urban Center is planning to add more than 1200 MF units and 5.775 million square feet commercial area.~~ These two items are expected to generate a great deal more traffic. A solution to the increased traffic could be a dedicated, continuous, closed-loop light rail along Route 28. This loop could serve major employers along the Keynote Employment area,

commuters from the rail along the Toll Road and arrivals/departures at Dulles Airport. The loop could also serve shoppers, residents and their guests. This loop could replace the additional north and south (7th and 8th) lane called for on the CTP map.

Should the Board wish to explore this possibility, the Commission recommends that the Board allocate resources and prioritize it in their agenda.

11. In addition to the light rail that could operate along Route 28, a major corridor within Loudoun County, the Commission recognizes the need for additional connections across the Potomac River to reduce congestion at existing crossings (i.e. Route 15). The Commission recommends that the Board of Supervisors allocate resources to allow the study of the extending the ~~light rail~~^{light rail} corridor across the Potomac (or under) north to Maryland and on to Rockville.

added.

